DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 300 380 TM 012 167

AUTHOR Guerrero, Frank; Goldberg, Phyllis
TITLE Mentor Teacher Internship Program, 1986-87. OEA Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn. Office of Educational Assessment.
PUB DATE Jan 88
NOTE 80p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Beginning Teachers; Elementary Secondary Education; *Faculty Development; *Mentors; Peer Relationship; Principals; *Program Evaluation; Public Schools; Teacher Effectiveness; *Teacher Interns; Teacher Persistence
IDENTIFIERS *Mentor Teacher Internship Program; *New York City Board of Education; Peer Modeling

ABSTRACT

The Mentor Teacher Internship Program (MTIP) provided first-year provisional teachers with an experienced mentor teacher in the context of a supportive, non-evaluative peer relationship. The pilot program, implemented by the New York City Board of Education and the United Federation of Teachers, focused on increasing teacher effectiveness and teacher retention rate. The 1986-87 program was funded by the New York State Education Department's Office of Demonstration Programs. The participants included 42 mentors (teachers with at least 5 years of teaching experience in the New York City Public School system) and 73 interns from 23 schools in 13 community school districts in Manhattan, Brooklyn, Queens, and the Bronx. The study involved interviews with and surveys of participants and fellow staff, participant logs, and on-site visits. Significant findings are reported in the areas of staff development, expectations and final impressions of participants and other staff, and student performance. As of June 30, 1987, the MTIP has been generally effective in meeting its objectives. It is recommended that: (1) a substitute recruitment program linked to the MTIP should be implemented; (2) teachers who substitute for mentors should be made an integral part of the mentor team; (3) mentor-intern confidentiality should be retained; (4) principals, mentors, and interns should be informed about the MTIP prior to the school year; (5) temporary per diem teachers should be included as interns; and (6) mentors should be provided with additional staff development support. (TJH)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

MENTOR TEACHER INTERNSHIP
PROGRAM 1986-87

# OEA Evaluation Report

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

FRANK GUERRERO

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EVALUATION SECTION REPORT
Robert Tobias, Administrator
John Schoener, Senior Manager

January, 1988

# MENTOR TEACHER INTERNSHIP PROGRAM 1986-87

Prepared by the O.E.A.
Instructional Support
Evaluation Unit

Frank Guerrero,
Unit Manager

Phyllis Goldberg,
Evaluation Consultant

New York Public Schools
Office of Educational Assessment
Richard Guttenberg, Director



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

It is the policy of the Board of Education not to discriminate on the basis of race, creed, national origin, age, handicapping condition, sexual orientation, or sex, in its educational programs, activities, and employment policies, as required by law. Any person who believes he or she has been discriminated against should contact: Carole Guerra, Local Equal Opportunity Coordinator, Office of Educational Assessment, 110 Livingston Street, Room 743, Brooklyn, New York 11201. Inquiries regarding compliance with appropriate laws may also be directed to: Mercedes A. Nesfield, Director, Office of Equal Opportunity, 110 Livingston Street, Room 601, Brooklyn, New York; or the Director, Office of Civil Rights, U.S. Department of Education, 26 Federal Plaza, Room 33-130, New York, New York 10278.

Mentor Teacher Internship Program
Evaluation Summary, 1986-87

## BACKGROUND

The Mentor Teacher Internship Program provided first-year provisional teachers with an experienced mentor teacher in the context of a supportive, non-evaluative peer relationship. The purpose of the pilot program was to improve the teaching effectiveness of first-year teachers and increase their retention rate. The Mentor Teacher Internship Program was a joint project of the New York City Board of Education and the United Federation of Teachers. It was funded for the 1986-87 school year by the New York State Education Department, Office of Demonstration Programs.

## POPULATION SERVED

Forty-two mentors and 73 interns participated in the Mentor Teacher Internship Program. They represented 28 schools in 13 Community School Districts (C.S.D.s 1, 2, 5, 6, 8, 10, 15, 16, 17, 19, 23, 27, and 28) in the boroughs of Manhattan, Brooklyn, Queens and the Bronx. District superintendents brought the program into their school districts at their discretion; in some cases they informed the principals of eligible (that is, Comprehensive Assessment Report-designated) schools that the program was being assigned to them; in other cases they allowed principals to decide if they wanted the program. Eligible teachers applied to be mentors and were selected by a district-wide committee which included supervisory and administrative

personnel, teachers, and chapter chairpersons, including U.F.T. district representatives. The committee had to be composed of at least a majority of teachers. First-year teachers in schools selected for participation who met the mandated criteria for intern selection "automatically" became interns.

## PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the Mentor Teacher Internship Program were by June 30, 1987: 1) to improve significantly the teaching performance of the interns; 2) to foster a demonstrably positive view, on the part of the interns, of their own competence and potential as well as satisfaction with work skills useful for career development; 3) to decrease barriers to teacher retention, as a result of interns' greater competence and effectiveness; and 4) to teach mentor teachers such skills as peer observation, diagnosis, advising and conferencing as well as resource linking, knowledge of adult learning theory and research in effective mentoring.

## EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The evaluation of the program was based on a number of data sources: an initial survey at the beginning of the implementation of the program disclosed participants' first reactions to and perceptions of the program. Interns and mentors were regularly asked to evaluate all staff development workshops and conferences in which they participated; mentors and interns maintained and submitted detailed logs of their activities

connected with the program; during on-site visits to selected schools and District Offices, in-depth interviews were conducted with participants in the program, principals, chapter chairpersons, and District Office personnel most closely associated with the program. Finally, towards the end of the year surveys were done of mentors, interns and principals to elicit their perceptions of, comments on and suggestions for improving the program. In addition, comparisons were made between the reading and mathematics achievement of M.T.I.P. intern's students and of other new teachers' students. These data, accompanied by interviews of the Central Board and United Federation of Teachers coordinators of the program, form the basis for the evaluation.

## FINDINGS

By June 30, 1987 the Mentor Teacher Internship Program had been generally effective in meeting its stated objectives. Among the major evaluation findings were the following:

### Staff Development

- In general, the mentors' and interns' evaluation of the training they received was very high. They consistently expressed a preference for more hands-on training and less "theory."
- The three most frequent activities of mentors and interns as reported in their logs were conferencing, preparing/planning, and viewing/visiting. While the interns had identified watching other teachers teach as the "most helpful" M.T.I.P. activity, it is not what they did most frequently.
- The topics that most often formed the content of the mentors' and interns' activities were program aspects, classroom management, reading, procedural items, math,

and other communications arts -- with "seasonal" fluctuations for such topics as student performance, report cards, and testing/teacher-made test construction.

- Reading was consistently the most important topic compared to other school subjects such as math, science, other communications arts and foreign language.

- Classroom management declined in importance as the focus of activity over the course of the school year, indicating that this was a skill which interns mastered.

- Program aspects remained a consistent focus of activity, averaging 28 percent of the mentors' time and 18 percent of the interns' time over the course of the school year.

Expectations

- Initial surveys of mentors and interns at the outset of the program indicated high expectations. More than 70 percent of the interns said they expected the program to help them become better teachers, learn new techniques, and gain valuable knowledge about their profession.

- Principals -- despite reporting initial negative reactions to the criteria used for intern selection -- acknowledged their expectation that the program would have a positive effect on mentors, interns and their students.

- The most controversial issue to emerge from the M.T.I.P. concerned the time participants would spend out of the classroom. However, most of the interns and mentors said they did not regard their absence from the classroom as necessarily problematic as long as they had competent coverage.

- The principals' summing up of their initial sentiments and their suggestions for improving the M.T.I.P. centered on their view that principals should be included in the planning as well as the implementation of the program.

Final Impressions

- The mentors rated the program most helpful in the development of such skills and self-perceptions as "sharing experiences about stress and coping mechanisms," "being able to diagnose interns' needs," "providing advice," "developing self-confidence as a teacher," "becoming sensitive to different teaching styles," "feeling better about being a teacher," and "perceiving that your work is valued by others." More than 90

percent of these mentors said that the M.T.I.P. responded to their "needs for support and professional growth" in the mentor role.

- The interns rated the program as having been most helpful in the areas of "development of self-confidence as a teacher," "feeling comfortable in exchanging ideas with people with whom you work," "use of management skills which make good use of time and other resources, minimize interruptions, and keep students engaged," "feeling comfortable in approaching and working with other teachers," "knowing where to turn in the school when you need to resolve problems," and "perceiving that teaching is work through which you can express yourself."

- These interns rated their progress highest in terms of "I have established a good rapport with my students, as individuals and as a group" and "I know where to turn in the school(s) when I need to resolve problems."

- The M.T.I.P. had an extraordinarily positive impact on mentors' job satisfaction.

- Nearly 80 percent of the interns who responded to the final Intern Survey said they planned to continue teaching in their current assignment during 1987-88.

Student Performance

- In comparing the reading and mathematics achievement of a sample of M.T.I.P. interns' students with the achievement of a sample of students of new teachers who were not participants in the program, it was found that the interns' students showed scores of two and one N.C.E.s -- in reading and mathematics, respectively -- higher than the scores of other new teachers' students.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are based on suggestions put forward by the participants in the M.T.I.P. and others associated with it, inferences drawn from their comments on and criticisms of the program, and observations made during site visits to selected schools.

- Implement a substitute recruitment program, linked to the M.T.I.P. in funding and organization, that would

guarantee competent, reliable coverage in participating schools, rather than leave coverage to each local school.

- District Superintendents should meet with and explain the program to principals, who in turn should take responsibility for introducing it to other teaching staff, chapter chairpersons, parents and students. In particular, teachers who substitute for mentors and interns should be made an integral part of the school and the mentoring team and included in joint lesson planning, etc.

- Mentor-intern confidentiality should be retained. (There was no breach of confidentiality during the first year of the program.)

- Inform principals, mentors and interns about the program before the start of the school year.

- Include Temporary Per Diem (T.P.D.) teachers among the new teachers eligible to be interns. Exempt experienced teachers new to the New York City public school system but not to teaching.

- Provide mentors with additional hands-on, role playing-based training in mentoring as well as instructional staff development in subject areas.

TABLE OF CONTENTS


| | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| I. | Introduction | 1 |
| | Program Overview | 1 |
| | Program Objectives | 2 |
| | Evaluation Procedures | 3 |
| | Scope of This Report | 3 |
| II. | Program Implementation | 5 |
| | Program Description | 5 |
| | Time Allotments | 6 |
| | Program Administration | 6 |
| | Staff Development | 7 |
| | Activities | 12 |
| III. | First Impressions: Great Expectations | 15 |
| | Initial Reactions | 16 |
| | Selection Criteria | 18 |
| | Expectations | 20 |
| | Perceptions: Self and Others | 26 |
| | Degree of Work Required | 28 |
| | Out of Classroom Time | 29 |
| | Classroom Visits | 32 |
| | Comments and Suggestions | 33 |
| IV. | Site Visits | 35 |
| | Principals | 36 |
| | Mentors | 41 |
| | Interns | 45 |
| | Chapter Chairpersons | 49 |
| | District Office Personnel | 50 |
| V. | Final Impressions: Looking Back | 52 |
| | Surveys | 52 |
| | Student Achievement | 61 |
| VI. | Conclusions and Recommendations | 62 |
| | Appendix A | 67 |
| | Appendix B | 69 |

# I. INTRODUCTION

## PROGRAM OVERVIEW

In an effort to improve the teaching effectiveness of first-year provisional teachers and increase their retention rate, the Board of Education and the United Federation of Teachers (U.F.T.) jointly applied for and received a grant from the New York State Education Department, Office of Demonstration Programs. The purpose of the grant was to fund a pilot Mentor Teacher Internship Program (M.T.I.P.) for the 1986-87 school year which would provide first-year teachers with an experienced mentor teacher in the context of a supportive, non-evaluative peer relationship. Experience in other states indicates that such a relationship is effective in significantly improving teacher effectiveness and in reversing low retention rates. The program placed strong emphasis on staff development of both mentors and interns.

Forty-two mentors and 72 interns participated in the Mentor Teacher Internship Program during the 1986-87 school year. They represented 28 elementary schools in 13 Community School Districts (C.S.D.s 1, 2, 5, 6, 8, 10, 15, 16, 17, 19, 23, 27, and 28) in the boroughs of Manhattan, Brooklyn, Queens and the Bronx. District Superintendents brought the program into their school districts at their discretion: in some cases they informed the principals of eligible schools that the program was being assigned to them; in other cases they allowed principals to decide if they wanted the program. All of the city's 392

Comprehensive Assessment Report (C.A.R.)-designated schools were eligible for the M.T.I.P. Based on student performance on various tests administered by New York State, attendance figures and drop-out rates, these are schools which have been identified by the State Education Department as most in need of help. Eligible teachers applied to be mentors and were selected by a district-wide committee which included supervisory and administrative personnel, teachers, U.F.T. district representatives, and chapter chairpersons. The committee had to have a majority of teachers. First-year teachers in schools selected for participation who met the mandated criteria for intern selection "automatically" became interns.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

Objectives established to further the project goals included:

(1) By June 30, 1987, interns will have made significant performance improvement in the range, depth and variety of knowledge of teaching in their subject area.

(2) By June 30, 1987, interns will demonstrate a positive view of their own competence and potential, as well as satisfaction with work skills useful for career development.

(3) By June 30, 1987, as a result of becoming more competent and effective through their participation in the Mentor-Intern Program, barriers to teacher retention will be decreased.

(4) By June 30, 1987, mentor teachers will demonstrate effective skills developed by a process of training and practical

application.

EVALUATION PROCEDURES

In order to "track" the interns' development, surveys were taken of them, the mentors, and principals at various points in the year. An initial survey at the beginning of the implementation of the program disclosed participants' first reactions to and perceptions of the program. Interns and mentors were regularly asked to evaluate all staff development workshops and conferences in which they participated; during on-site visits to selected schools and District Offices, in-depth interviews were conducted with participants in the program, principals, chapter chairpersons, and District Office personnel most closely associated with the program; interns and mentors maintained and submitted detailed logs of their activities connected with the program. In addition, comparisons were made between the reading and mathematics achievement of M.T.I.P. interns' students and of other new teachers' students. Finally, towards the end of the year, surveys were administered to mentors, interns and principals to elicit their perceptions of, comments on, and suggestions for ways to improve the program. These data, accompanied by interviews of the Central Board and U.F.T. coordinators of the program, form the basis for the evaluation.

SCOPE OF THIS REPORT

This reports presents, in six chapters, the Office of Educational Assessment's evaluation of the M.T.I.P. in its pilot

year 1986-87. Staff development is discussed in Chapter II. Chapter III presents brief profiles of the mentors and interns, and describes initial perceptions and expectations of the program. The fourth chapter reports on site visits. Chapter V contains the results of surveys of mentors, interns and principals taken towards the end of the year. Conclusions and recommendations are stated in Chapter VI.

## II. PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Mentor Teacher Intern Program, one of 24 such pilot projects throughout New York State, was structured according to terms mandated by the state legislature.

Board of Education vacancy notices were posted in all comprehensive Assessment Report schools and qualified teachers -- those with at least five years teaching experience in the New York City public school system -- were invited to apply for the position of mentor. Written applications went to a district-wide Mentor Selection Committee comprising a designee of the Superintendent, the principal of every school from which there were applicants, the United Federation of Teachers (U.F.T.) chapter chairperson in every such school, the district representative of the U.F.T., and a teacher representative from every school. A teacher majority on the committee reflected the teacher-to-teacher philosophy and practice of the M.T.I.P. The committee selected the mentors -- subject to the final approval of the superintendent -- after review of written applications and interviews.

The committees, many of which evolved into on-going structures that functioned in an informal "mentoring" capacity to teachers in the program, have since been renamed Mentor Selection-Advisory committees.

All (and only) first-year probationary teachers with less

than one year of teaching experience in the New York City system were eligible to become interns. Such teachers, teaching in schools selected by the superintendents in consultation with principals, "automatically" became interns.

TIME ALLOTMENTS

According to the legislatively mandated terms of the M.T.I.P., 20 percent of interns' in-classroom time (six periods) was covered by substitutes while they took part in M.T.I.P. designated activities. Ten percent of mentor teachers' in-classroom time (three periods) per intern was reserved for the M.T.I.P. Both mentors and interns were compensated for after classroom time spent in staff development and other required program activities. The district was compensated, through the grant funds, for mentor and intern classroom time spent in staff development and other required program activities.

PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

A three-person "team" administered the M.T.I.P. A Special Assistant to the Executive Director of Curriculum and Instruction served as the program supervisor, who assumed overall responsibility for the implementation of the M.T.I.P. Two regional coordinators, one representing the Central Board and the other the United Federation of Teachers -- this being a collaborative effort between the two entities -- acted as liaisons, troubleshooters and "mentors" to schools in their designated "regions": Manhattan, Queens, and the Bronx under one coordinator; Brooklyn -- the borough with most schools involved

in the program -- under the other.

STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Mentors and interns were formally introduced to the M.T.I.P. at two separate orientation meetings held at the Board of Education headquarters during the second week of November, 1986. A Mentor Staff Development Conference was held on November 18, 19 and 20; it was followed, over the next several months, by a series of seven half-day workshops, four of which were open to the interns. Finally, a M.T.I.P. retreat was held from May 28-31, 1987 at the Scanticon Executive Conference Center in Princeton, New Jersey for all participants in the program -- mentors, interns, replacement teachers and principals; District Office personnel who had been closely associated with the program; U.F.T. chapter chairpersons; U.F.T. district representatives; representatives of the Board of Education; and U.F.T. headquarters staff.

Mentor Staff Development Conference

The three-day conference, which took place November at the New York Urban Coalition's Center for Educational Leadership in Manhattan, was attended by 35 mentors (of the 42 mentors who eventually participated in the program, seven had not yet been selected). Its purpose was to familiarize the mentors with the goals, objectives, content and structure of the M.T.I.P. and to enhance their professional development. Peer observation skills, peer conferencing, resource linking skills, adult learning theory, clinical supervision, effective staff development

practices and problem-solving processes were the focus of the conference.

Mentors were asked to fill out separate questionnaires evaluating the first day's "Introduction to Mentoring" lecture given by the director of instruction, Performance Learning Systems, Inc.; Division of Curriculum and Instruction (D.C.I.) workshops in particular subject areas; and three New York City Teacher Centers Consortium workshops on the topics "Pouring the Foundations," "Establishing the Framework: Skill Building," and "Starting at the Ground Floor: Implementing the Design, Recording the Interaction."

In general, the mentors' evaluation of the conference was extremely high. The mentors gave "highest marks" to the workshops and sessions that they perceived as having: 1) clarified the mentor role for them cognitively and taught or enhanced skills for performing their role adequately; and 2) provided a respectful and supportive context in which they could learn. They expressed their criticisms in two forms; one set of responses reflected the mentors' positive evaluations of the conference by saying that there had not been enough of it -- enough time, enough detail or "specifics" and asking for more, including follow-up training. More explicit criticisms tended to focus on workshops, which were viewed as too general and/or too elementary. The concerns voiced by the mentors largely fell "outside" of the conference and focused on their perception that the project would fail if it did not have the support of

administrative and supervisory personnel in individual schools, most particularly their principals. The other primary concern was the lack of instructional materials at the conference and in the schools.

What follows is a selection of representative comments on each of these four themes.

1. The mentor role

- "We finally learned what our responsibilities are!!"
- "The program was explained and clarified more although I still have many questions."
- "Teacher Center workshops were excellent. They dealt with the realities of the job...."

2. Affect and atmosphere

- "I feel more comfortable in terms of the program."
- "I was particularly impressed with the mature, professional way in which we were treated. For three full days I've felt like a proud professional who is appreciated for the work I do."
- "The supportive milieu was most valuable and worthwhile and set the basis and tone for excellence."

3. Criticisms

- "I think we need more workshops -- hands on...more time devoted to HOW TO DO (The workshops in content areas these three days were too short)."
- "I would have liked more Teacher Center workshops where we had more time to get into actual mentor programming and ideas. More role playing."
- "The individual curriculum area workshops were not at all helpful. Perhaps future workshops could be divided into early childhood and upper grades. Also they should have been more hands-on, more specific and much less theory. Most teachers at these training sessions are highly experienced and do not need to listen to theory and more theory."

4. Concerns

- "Pressure must be available to deal with uncooperative administrators...."
- "Please!!! We need materials. Rush!!"

The following comments reflect the sentiments expressed about the conference as a whole:

- "I'm now happy to be part of this exciting program -- Thanks!"
- "After today I'm more convinced that I will be a more effective mentor than when I started the whole process."
- "It was an exciting experience for me as a teacher with eighteen years in the system. It has really ignited a spark in me as a person."

Half-Day Workshops

Mentors and interns who attended the half-day workshops consistently gave them high ratings. For example, the 35 mentors and 21 interns at the December 17, 1986 workshop on "Team Logs" rated it 3.1 on a scale of 1 to 4, where 1 equalled "poor" and 4 equalled "excellent." One mentor commented, "The filling out of logs and time sheets is a program necessity, and the training met this need."

Thirty mentors and five interns gave the February 18, 1987 workshop on "The Adult Learner" an overall rating of 3.4. In response to the question, "In view of your previous needs, how appropriate was this training?", mentors said:

- "It should be pointed out that it may be the mentor's fault when there is a lack of communication between mentor and intern."
- "I was concerned over whether I should be doing more with my intern. The workshop helped me to understand

the quality is much more important than the quantity of work I'm doing."

One mentor, answering the question, "What additional training or assistance related to today's topic, if any, would you like?", said:

- "A session devoted to our problems with the program as well as what is working well. How do we handle an intern who is possibly facing a 'u' rating?"

Fourteen mentors and ten interns attended the March 10, 1987, workshop on "Learning Centers," giving it an overall rating of 3.7. In response to a question about what additional training or assistance they would like, the participants echoed an often repeated theme: the desire for hands-on instruction.

- "Hands-on workshop to build a center I can take back to my classroom."
- "Additional workshop to make materials for classroom use."

Retreat

Over 100 participants attended the three-day retreat that brought together every branch of the M.T.I.P. "family." Participants were asked to evaluate the conference overall as well as each workshop they attended. The workshops were presented under the following titles: "Focus, Aim, Shoot!!!"; "Learning Centers"; "Introduction to Writing Process"; "Variety Is the Spice of Classroom Life"; "Questioning Strategies: Facilitating and Enhancing Instruction"; "Theme-Oriented Day"; "Second Languages in the Elementary School"; "The Fit Educator -- Calisthenics and Non-Impact Aerobics"; "Till We Meet Again --

Mentors and Interns"; "Creating Environments That Teach Thinking"; "Learning Styles: A Route to Effective Communication"; "Off To a Great Start"; and "The Newspaper: A New Textbook Every Day."

Using a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 equalled "Strongly Disagree," and 5 equalled "Strongly Agree," participants' mean responses to statements about the retreat were as follows: "Participants will be able to share information and experience about N.Y.C. Mentor Teacher Internship Program" (4.6); "Participants will be able to offer suggestions regarding future program implementation" (4.6); "Information offered through panel discussions was helpful" (4.6); "The conference was well organized" (4.8); "Individual needs and requests were appropriately met" (4.6); and "The conference site was satisfactory" (4.9).

Using the same scale, participants consistently gave the workshops very high ratings as well, according to such criteria as whether a workshop met its stated objectives (4.7); whether the content presented was useful (4.7); whether the content presented was well organized (4.8); and whether questions were well received and appropriately answered (4.8).

ACTIVITIES

Between December, 1986, and June, 1987, mentors and interns kept detailed logs of their activities related to the M.T.I.P. The logs showed whether the activities were performed "in school" or "per session," how much time was spent on them, with whom

they were done, and the topic of each activity. See Appendix A for the list of possible activities, and Appendix B for the list of possible topics. The mentors reported that throughout the year their three most frequent activities in school were conferencing, preparing/planning, and viewing/visiting. The mentors' per session time was also spent predominantly in conferencing and preparing/planning, with documenting and designing/developing taking the place of in-school viewing and visiting.

Not coincidentally, the interns spent most of their in school time conferencing, preparing/planning, and viewing/visiting -- except in June, when documenting replaced viewing/visiting. It is interesting to note that while the interns had identified watching other teachers teach as the "most helpful" M.T.I.P. activity, it is not what they did most frequently. The interns' per session time was spent conferencing, preparing/planning, and documenting, consulting, or designing/developing.

The topics that most often formed the content of these activities were program aspects, classroom management, reading, procedural items, math and other language arts -- with "seasonal" fluctuations for such topics as student performance, report cards, and testing/teacher-made test construction. Reading was consistently the most important topic -- as determined by the frequency with which it was the focus of activities reported by mentors and interns -- compared to other school subjects such as

math, science, other language arts, and foreign language. Classroom management declined in importance as the focus of activity over the course of the school year, indicating that this was a skill which interns mastered. Program aspects remained a consistent focus of activity, averaging more than one-fourth of the mentors' time and nearly one-fifth of the interns' time over the course of the school year.

## III. FIRST IMPRESSIONS: GREAT EXPECTATIONS

The first surveys of interns and mentors were taken at the beginning of the implementation of the M.T.I.P. All 73 interns and all 42 mentors completed and returned, respectively, Intern Survey Number 1 and Mentor Survey Number 1.

The average age of mentors was 43, and they had an average of 18 years of teaching experience. Nearly all the mentors held licenses in either common branches (77 percent) or in early childhood (21 percent), and 93 percent of the interns held a common branches license (the early childhood license was discontinued many years ago). The average age of the interns, most of whom -- like the mentors -- are women, was 36. Nearly half the interns have Master's degrees, and more than 60 percent have had some graduate training in early childhood. While 83 percent of the interns had done student teaching as undergraduates, 40 percent of them said the experience did not prepare them for their first year of teaching.

The first principal survey was administered during March, 1987. It was completed by 17 of the 22 participating principals.

A staff survey distributed at about the same time in all participating schools was completed by 145 teachers from 12 schools. More than half of those teachers said that they were given adequate time to apply for the mentor position but only six percent of them had done so.

Among the most important issues covered by the initial surveys of mentors, interns, other teaching staff, and principals

were the following:

- initial reactions
- selection criteria
- expectations
- intern and mentor roles
- perceptions: self and others
- out of classroom time

Mentors and principals were also asked whether participation in the M.T.I.P. entailed more work for them personally. The mentors were asked to summarize their perceptions of the program thus far. Staff and principals were invited to make comments and suggestions for improving the program.

INITIAL REACTIONS

The largest proportion of interns (43 percent) said they had responded positively to the news that they had been selected to participate in the M.T.I.P., although a significant percentage (36 percent) expressed "confusion" or "surprise" upon hearing the news. Most of the negative responses came from teachers chosen for the program who had previous teaching experience in private, including parochial, schools. Many of those who reported a negative initial response nevertheless thought they would benefit from the program. Other negative responses came from interns who said they had needed the program the previous year. Examples of this variety of responses follow.

- "I was excited, knowing that I have no real experience. I suspected that this program would be of great assistance to me."

- "I feel gratitude, tremendous excitement and relief."
- "I was surprised because I had four years experience, but I could use it."
- "I was glad to know that someone cared; however, I could have used it last year."
- "I was surprised and confused. Had already been teaching in Catholic schools for 10 years."
- "I feel a lot of training is required by the Board of Education, instead of letting a teacher experience her class and work with them. I have also had a lot of previous teaching experience."

By contrast, a majority of the principals (59 percent) reported that their initial reaction to the M.T.I.P. was negative -- although a significant percentage of them (41 percent) said they were supportive of the program. Many of the principals who reported having negative reactions were critical of the fact that they had neither been consulted prior to its implementation nor given more control over it. A number of principals also expressed reservations about the amount of time mentors and interns would be out of their classrooms. The following responses express this mixed reaction.

- "I was initially surprised since I did not apply for the program. I could not understand how I could be the recipient of such a program without any discussion or input from me."
- "I felt I had been excluded from an important decision-making process, and little consideration had been given to the impact this program would have on the school."
- "Although I am a strong advocate of teacher training, I was not pleased because of the excess amount of release time from the classroom which was involved."
- "I thought that the program was worthwhile for the school in general."

- "I am pleased because I had some outstanding teachers who would make excellent mentors. I also felt that neither I nor my assistants had time to train inexperienced teachers."

SELECTION CRITERIA

Despite equivocal initial reactions mentors, interns and principals were overwhelmingly satisfied with the mentor selection process. All but five of the mentors said that they were satisfied with the criteria according to which they had been selected, although 11 of them indicated that they would change the criteria: "More teaching experience than the five years currently required" was one alternative criterion and "the opinion of supervisors" was named as an additional criterion.

Many of the interns said they were unfamiliar with the mentor selection process; fewer than half answered the question. The responses of those who did answer were overwhelmingly positive. Interns said they were satisfied with the criteria for mentor selection by a ratio of seven to one. Most of the interns were also unfamiliar with the "matching interns and mentors" process. The positive/negative ratio was smaller, 18 percent of the interns responding positively and 15 percent negatively. Many who favored "changing the criteria used to match interns and mentors" (19 percent) thought mentors and interns should "be on the same grade level."

More than three quarters of the principals (77 percent) knew the criteria used in the selection of mentors. Fifty-three percent were satisfied with those criteria and would not change

them; 41 percent said they were dissatisfied and would change the criteria. The belief that there was a need for more principal input in the M.T.I.P. expressed itself in the suggestions of more than half of the principals who wanted to change the criteria used to select mentors:

- "The principal of the school should have a say on the caliber, qualifications, attendance record and attitude of the mentor for programs in the school."
- "I would use only retired teachers or supervisors as mentors because there would be no disruption of the regular school program."
- "The most beneficial improvement would be to have more A.P.s in each school to train and supervise."

On the question of intern selection, 82 percent of the principals said they were familiar with the selection criteria; 65 percent were dissatisfied with them. Again, over half of those principals who would change the criteria stated that they thought they needed to be more involved in the selection of the interns:

- "Principals should have been asked for suggestions and input about program and the selection of which interns."
- "The least experienced teacher regardless of license or status (e.g., T.P.D.s) must be included in this program."

More than half of the principals who responded knew what the criteria were for selecting schools to participate in the program; 36 percent did not. Nearly twice as many principals (47 percent) were "dissatisfied" or "very dissatisfied" with the selection criteria as were those who were "satisfied" or "very satisfied." Almost 59 percent of the principals said they would

change the criteria used in selecting the schools, compared to 24 percent who said they would not; 18 percent had "no comment." Of the ten who said they would change the criteria, six wanted principals to be more involved in the program, including initiating the request for it in their schools.

EXPECTATIONS

The mentors' and interns' expectations of the M.T.I.P. were high. More than 70 percent of the interns said they expected the program to help them become better teachers, learn new techniques, and gain valuable knowledge about their profession:

- "This program will give me ideas, reassurance, build my confidence, improve my teaching skills, etc."
- "I will learn how to handle some discipline problems that have come up. Also I will learn classroom techniques of the regular classroom teacher, since I am a cluster teacher."
- "This program will help me to be an effective teacher."
- "This program will help me to use the knowledge of a mentor that comes only from experience. They may be able to foresee and prevent problems, because they have already experienced similar circumstances."
- "I expect it to be a challenging and interesting learning experience."

In response to a question about the mentors' role the interns said the mentors would:

- "...help interns become better educators."
- "...(be) a guide, peer, role-model, a resource."
- "...aid interns in any way possible in classroom or in resources."
- "...help solve problems, to be facilitators."

- "...be friends to interns, to give confidence and keep interns' spirits up."

Interns expected to benefit personally as well as professionally from participating in the M.T.I.P. Only two respondents (out of the total 73) thought there would be "no benefit," while 70 said that the program would help them "be more confident," "build relationships with peers," and make them "able to give the students more."

The mentors' expectations of what the M.T.I.P. would do for interns and their perceptions of the interns' role in the program can be characterized in subjective and objective terms which are closely related and intertwined: if interns felt less isolated they could share their concerns and ask questions that would enhance their skills and in turn increase their self-confidence. Among the mentors' expectations for the interns were:

- "Self-confidence, sense of belonging. Learning new techniques and methods without fear of rejection or failure. Learn that teaching can be fun."
- "It is with her questions and insecurities that I will deal."
- "I think the intern might feel threatened on one hand -- but relieved on the other -- they would no longer be at sea."
- "I hope that this program will help the more inexperienced teacher become a more professional and competent teacher."
- "Kindle and inflame teachers with enthusiasm and excitement about teaching."
- "Give them a sense of belonging, a sense of security and help to get them through the beginning challenges of classroom management, discipline and paper work ... They will become less frustrated with the system. Keep the burning desire to give it their best. They will ask

questions, try new techniques, broaden their scope of what teaching is about and eventually impart their learning."

The interns thought that the mentors would also derive advantages from participating in the program:

- "Program will foster professional development opportunity, build rapport with others on staff (i.e., learn about new staff, utilize skills of more experienced staff -- integrate both), etc."
- "My mentor can show me how to run a regular classroom better since I have been out of the regular classroom for about 20 years."
- "Program will be supportive, helpful and have new and varied ideas to be used in teaching situations, classroom management and discipline."
- "Mentors will be able to use their years of experience to facilitate the growth of new teachers."
- "The mentors will benefit in knowing that they have helped new teachers in the field and have given them the support and encouragement that they need."

The mentors' reasons for applying to participate in the Mentor Teacher-Internship Program and their expectations of what the M.T.I.P. would do for them and how they would benefit clustered around a combination of altruistic and more self-interested motives:

- "I felt I could help inexperienced teachers and at the same time grow professionally."
- "I <u>feel</u> like a professional -- the way it is being planned and organized."
- "I, like most beginning N.Y.C. school teachers, got off to a rather 'shaky' start. But with the 'guidance' of an excellent A.P. at the time, I learned the ropes. I wanted to do the same for a beginning teacher."
- "To help school regain better standing."
- "It would help me use my knowledge with adults and be

recognized officially."

- "Meeting new people, learning new skills, advancing to a new job assignment."
- "I'm enrolling in a Program for Administration and Supervision in the spring and I feel that this program will also act as part of an internship for me."
- "Teachers should have been training other teachers all along. This is an important and valuable program."
- "I would like to possibly teach 'teaching' on a college level some day."
- "...renewed interest in what I'm doing."
- "It will help me to keep abreast of work in the curriculum areas and make me a better teacher and supervisor (some day)."
- "I like to do something a little different every year, so I don't get into a job rut."

Principals' expectations regarding the effects the M.T.I.P. would have on mentors, interns and students were more contradictory. Having previously reported negative reactions to the criteria used for intern selection, for example, the principals acknowledged that the program would nevertheless have a positive effect on those three "categories" of people involved in and directly affected by the program. Fifty-nine percent of the principals had positive expectations of the effect the program would have on mentors compared with the 24 percent who expected a negative effect. More principals (53%) had positive expectations of the effect the program would have on interns than negative expectations (35 percent). Finally, more principals (47 percent) had positive expectations of the program's effect on students than negative expectations (29 percent). Some typical

responses to this question:

About mentors:

- "The program will give them an opportunity because they have shared their expertise."
- Their self-image will improve because they have shared their expertise with others and have seen how much they can help."

About interns:

- "It will greatly improve their classroom performance."
- "They will have an opportunity to learn the best methods from an expert teacher. When they have a problem, they will have a colleague (mentor!) to whom they can go for assistance."
- "I feel having interns working more with their own class would be much better -- rather than losing six periods a week and five preps -- this is a disservice to them and causes more problems than it solves."
- "I cannot comment on expectations as I have no input into the program."

About students:

- "They are being taught through the best methods, thanks to the assistance of the mentor."

The principals' expectations of what overall effect the M.T.I.P. would have varied considerably. While 47 percent believed that the program would have a negative effect on their schools, 41 percent thought it would have a positive effect. The following comments reflect two typical points of view:

- "The school will have outstanding programs, e.g., centers in early childhood grades; excellent hands-on science program; good discipline and morale; higher reading and math scores on city-wide tests, etc., as a result of this program."
- I do not have high expectations for this program, since it tries to duplicate work already done by supervisors

and our district trainers and staff developers."

Eleven percent of the principals did not respond to this question.

Despite some ambivalence, the "other" teachers who responded to Staff Survey #1 had high expectations of what the M.T.I.P. would do for staff development:

- "1) Raise morale; 2) Add to cooperative spirit; 3) Raise level of professionalism; 4) Give new people a good start.
- "Undoubtedly, it should provide a more professional new group and more effective new teachers. Instead of just time doing it, then ripening is forced."
- "More confident and competent new teachers. Compensation for veteran mentor teachers. A valuable interchange of ideas between new and veteran teachers."

Similarly, although there were exceptions, most of the teachers responding to the Staff Survey #1 expected there to be long-term benefits from the M.T.I.P. -- for teachers:

- "To help them to benefit from an experienced teacher to not make the same mistakes."
- Give new teachers a sense of belonging."

for students:

- "Great, because teachers helping teachers can only benefit the students."
- "More effective learning -- they won't have to survive inexperienced teachers."

and for themselves:

- "More open attitude -- new pool of ideas."
- "As the staff becomes more effective and knowledgeable, so would I and teaching would be much more interesting."

- "Increased staff morale."
- "Any part of the chain that is strengthened is strength for the whole."
- "I now know who to go to for help if I'm having a teaching problem."

PERCEPTIONS: SELF AND OTHERS

In line with the principals' perceptions of the mentors' role in the M.T.I.P. as "trainers" and "scholars" who would be "providing support" and "teaching methodology," the mentors generally regard themselves as highly skilled in the same objective/subjective areas in which they expected their interns to benefit. The mentors also perceived themselves as being highly regarded by their teacher colleagues. Where their colleagues were familiar with the M.T.I.P., the mentor said that these colleagues respected their mentor status and admired their commitment:

- "Perceived as one of the better teachers in the school, deserving of position...(I have the ) ability to advise new teachers, ability to give constructive criticism in non-threatening ways, not afraid of supervisors."
- "Other members of the staff feel that I am qualified to help an intern because of my outgoing disposition and classroom skills...(I have) an ability to work with children in a relaxed, learning situation -- an ability to create a learning atmosphere within a disciplined structure."
- "Some are very proud of me. Some are sorry they didn't apply. Some are resentful they weren't selected. On the whole I think most have a renewed respect for me...I am empathetic to the problems of new teachers. I can help them re: communication with supervisors, curriculum coverage, exciting learning methods and

maintaining their serenity."

- "The teachers in my school congratulated me on receiving this position and seemed quite enthusiastic about my new position."

But, the mentors reported, frequently their colleagues were not informed about the M.T.I.P.; in some cases, they said, other teachers misunderstood, and even resented, the provisions for and the nature of the mentors' "free time" -- the release time provided for in the program. One mentor said the perception was that "I am crazy for taking on extra work."

But although it might have been the case that many non-M.T.I.P. teachers were not adequately informed about the program -- more than 54 percent reported having received "none" or "very little" information about it and 51 percent said that the information had been "inadequate" -- they were respectful of the mentor role, perceiving the mentor as a "guide," a "model," and an "example." Fewer than 14 percent of those responding were "dissatisfied" or "very dissatisfied" with the criteria used to select mentors.

The principals perceived the role of intern as that of "a learner," "a neophyte," and the interns perceived themselves in a similar way. Fifty-one percent of the interns felt they needed a mentor. Moreover, more than one third of those interns who reported a negative reaction in response to Question 2, "What was your initial reaction upon knowing that you had been selected for this program?", nevertheless agreed with their peers that they, too, needed a mentor. Overall, more than twice as many interns

said they needed a mentor as did those who said they did not:

- " I do have many questions regarding procedures, curriculum, planning -- a mentor has the time and experience to address and teach these questions thoroughly."
- "With the mentor's help, I hope to improve in my profession."

While teachers responding to the staff survey agreed with everyone else that the role of the intern was "to learn" and "to gain," to be "an observer" and "to select the best of the mentor's ideas," these teachers were unique in suggesting that the interns also brought something valuable to the school in general and the mentor-intern relationship in particular. One such teacher wrote, "The intern is fresh and can bring enthusiasm and energy to a school."

DEGREE OF WORK REQUIRED

With few exceptions, the mentors said they expected the M.T.I.P. to mean more work; five "didn't know" and one expected "more or the same amount" of work. For some, the extra work entailed learning new curriculum areas or grade levels; for others, planning for their out-of-classroom time. Others referred (unhappily) to the "paper work" required of participants in the program.

The principals, however, were evenly divided between those who expected that the program would mean more work for them and those who said there would be no change in the amount of their work. Seventeen percent of the principals thought that the program would actually mean less work for them. The following

were typical responses:

- "I welcome the program and am willing to help develop it to be more effective each year." (No change in the amount of work.)
- "The mentors are doing all the scheduling, planning, etc. I have no real extra work to do."
- "The scheduling was difficult. The change in the children's routines caused negative changes in their behavior which in the end causes more work for me."

For the principals, the question of how much work the program would involve was closely connected to the issue of scheduling. A significant majority of them, 65 percent, said that scheduling for the program would be difficult, whereas 35 percent thought it would be relatively easy:

- "It took a whole lot of re-programming, but that was because we didn't have a teacher to cover the program until February 1."
- "Mentors, interns and career personnel set up the schedule."
- "We are an O.C.S.I.P. (Office of Comprehensive School Improvement Planning) school...and have locked periods. Providing the scheduling necessary for this program was extremely difficult."

OUT OF CLASSROOM TIME

Probably the most controversial issue to emerge from the M.T.I.P. concerned the time participants would spend out of the classroom. Twenty-nine of the mentors did not regard being out of their classrooms for 20 percent of the time as necessarily problematic, as long as they had competent coverage. One mentor said, "I feel this will require me to utilize my remaining time with the children as effectively as possible." For cluster

teachers, their "absence" was not even a potential problem. The mentors who were critical of this aspect of the program explained:

- "I'm not happy about this, because I have a slow class and they need not only the teaching time but the structure and stability of (one) teacher."
- "I'm worried my administrator is going to short change my kids by giving them gym six periods a week."
- I do not like it at all. The quality of substitutes is terrible and I do not like the standards set being lowered by a sub who does not care to teach or follow plans. I have been lucky enough to get a good sub. However, I was quite worried before this sub agreed and if she hadn't, I would not have applied for the position."

A significant number of interns also expressed hesitation about spending the stipulated time out of their classrooms. However, most -- like the mentors - said they did not regard their absence form the classroom as necessarily problematic, as long as they had competent coverage. Forty-seven percent of the interns who responded to this question said the crucial factors were: quality of substitute coverage; competence of the substitute teachers; and the confidence of those substitute teachers. Twenty-four percent of the interns regarded the out-of-classroom time positively. Some typical comments:

- "This is clearly one of the drawbacks of the program."
- "I don't like this. It is sometimes difficult to get competent and confident people to fill in for preps in my school."
- "I know I could put the time to good use watching and planning with more experienced staff members. However, it is a lot of time away from the class."

- "I don't really like the idea of being away from my class, but I feel this will be an effective program and it must be necessary."
- "It will be difficult in the beginning constantly changing teachers in the room. Once the children are used to it, it should be all right."
- "This is a great idea, and very necessary. It is clearly the best method!"

Two thirds of teachers responding to the Staff Survey #1 said that their prep-period schedule had not changed due to the M.T.I.P. Less than a third of the teachers responded negatively to the program's requirement that participating mentors and interns be out of the classrooms for 20 percent of the time:

- "How else can they effectively perform their functions if they do not have some release time?"
- "I am in full agreement -- time is vital to the success of the program. As long as classes are covered by licensed teachers, teaching curriculum areas with consistency -- I do not feel children will suffer. In some cases, children who need change will benefit. The program is definitely needed and should continue. If we don't get and keep good new teachers, then what?"

One teacher who disagreed said somewhat confusedly, "I do not feel this is necessary. Many of us have had the beginning years of training where we depended on other teachers for advice. There was never a mentor-intern program before -- and we became adequate and viable teachers. The program is fine as it stands -- no further allotted time should be given."

Predictably, it was the principals who had the most reservations about the out-of-classroom time mandated for M.T.I.P. participants. Seventy-six percent expected problems to

arise from mentors and interns being out of their assigned classrooms:

- "...the lack of continuity of instruction is a problem."
- "...it is an extraordinary problem perceived by all...."

CLASSROOM VISITS

Regardless of their hesitation regarding time spent out of their classrooms, both mentors and interns were overwhelmingly in favor of teacher-class visits. Only two of the mentors expressed any reservations about having interns visit their classes. Many said they were "used to it," and others welcomed the opportunity to share (and, by their own admission, to show off) what they do well.

Similarly, the interns were almost unanimous in their enthusiasm. Eighty-eight percent responded positively to having mentors visit and help with their classroom assignments. Using words like "terrific" and "great," interns said they expected to benefit both personally and professionally from teacher class visits:

- "I would absolutely love to have a more experienced teacher working with me in my classroom!"
- "I love the idea; I feel I would benefit greatly from constructive criticism -- it would make me a much better educator."
- "I enthusiastically welcome the assistance and crave the advice."
- While I might feel slightly uncomfortable/nervous, I know I will benefit from the feedback."
- I think it will be very helpful, I am very confident."

COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS

In the initial survey, mentors requested further training in a broad range of areas. These included particular subjects, such as English as a Second Language (E.S.L.), reading and science; general skills such as time management, planning and organizing techniques; and skills specifically related to the M.T.I.P. such as "how to tactfully give criticism," "learning styles of adults," and "how to deal with stage fright!"

The mentors summed up their feelings at the start of the program:

- "I am proud to be selected as a mentor teacher. I remember the value of the buddy teacher and the sense of security I had as a new teacher. It is long overdue!"
- "I have negative feelings about the program because I hate to put time and effort into a program if it will be dropped the following year for something else."
- "Good luck! I hope it works. It's a great idea."
- "It is a great opportunity for me and I will try to do the best."

Most of the suggestions made by teachers responding to Staff Survey #1 centered around expanding the eligibility criteria for interns:

- "Make all first-year teachers eligible for the program."
- "If possible, we may try to include teachers who are not necessarily 'new' to the system. Some 'older' teachers may benefit from this program -- what about a permanent on-call mentor assigned to each school?"
- "The program seems to be working well. I might consider extending it to 'teachers in need of help,' not only to new teachers."
- "This program should be available to anyone who needs

assistance -- including T.P.D.'s."

Some teachers just wanted to know more about the program:

- "...give feedback to other staff members about successes/failures."
- "The program, its progress, and benefits should be discussed at staff meetings."

The principals' summing up of their initial sentiments and their suggestions for improving the M.T.I.P. centered around their view that principals should be included in the planning as well as the implementation of the program:

- "The principal of the school hasn't received any communication from the District Office or Central Board since the implementation phase in Fall, 1986. Now an evaluation team shows up for the principal's input and suggestions in April, 1987."
- "Provide another assistant principal so that all can benefit from increased supervision of instruction. The teachers need to stay with their classes and provide continuity of instruction. If a mentor must be given, then a full-time position should be made, and the mentor should be supervised by the principal as all the other teachers are."
- "Please let the principals decide who the interns should be!!"
- "Let's continue the program, but you must consult with the principals more, especially on who should be chosen and how often mentoring is needed."

Among the other suggestions was that the Council of Supervisors and Administrators (C.S.A.) and the U.F.T. should plan the program jointly.

A final comment:

- "I would like to continue the program as it now stands for another year (1987-88). In the 1988-89 school year, I would suggest expanding it further."

## IV. SITE VISITS

The research design included a plan to visit a sample of schools participating in the Mentor Teacher Internship Program in order to get an "on the ground" glimpse of how the program was working. Accordingly, 12 schools in ten districts in the boroughs of Manhattan, Queens, Brooklyn, and the Bronx were selected for on-site visits between March 11 and May 22, 1987. The schools will not be further identified in order to preserve the anonymity of those interviewed.

Separate interviews were conducted with all 12 of the school principals (one was an acting principal), all of the participating mentors (16), all of the participating interns (28), and 11 local U.F.T. chapter chairpersons (the chapter chairperson at one school was absent on the day of the visit and did not respond to a written request to contact the interviewer by phone to set up an interview appointment). Two mentors were also their schools' chapter chairpersons; they were interviewed in both capacities. Also interviewed were six district superintendents, one deputy superintendent, and three senior district office staff members who serve as liaisons to the M.T.I.P. With the exception of one intern, one district superintendent, and two district office staff members who were interviewed by phone, all of the interviews were conducted in person.

PRINCIPALS

The principals' initial reaction to knowing that their schools had been selected for the M.T.I.P. were conflicted; they were variously "elated," "surprised," "concerned...what would happen to the mentor's class?" One principal's reaction was "dismay. The teachers I had appointed didn't need it (mentoring). How did the superintendent appoint us without discussing it with us?" Another principal's initial reaction was "...chagrin. The principals of this district were not consulted...." This principal reported fearing that interns "would be insulted, see it as a kind of a punishment," but those fears had been "dispelled." Other principals were similarly critical of their exclusion from the school selection process. One seemed to interpret the selection as a criticism: "Not all schools on the CAR list are the same; improvement was not taken into consideration." But another principal said, "I was glad. I had teachers who would be excellent mentors. I've been out of the classroom for 23 years and things like learning centers were after my time. I just felt it would be beneficial for the school." Only one principal openly said, "I resent the program...it was imposed on my school...I agree with the C.S.A. (Council of Supervisors and Administrators) position, and not because I am a C.S.A. member...."

Of the teachers in the school, this principal said, "Nobody wanted to be in the mentor program! They didn't accept it with

open arms. I had to sell it despite my resentment. I am doing it under protest." In spite of this opposition, the mentor and chapter chairperson reported that this principal had done whatever was necessary for the implementation and ongoing support of the program. A principal who reported refusing the program "in October in a letter to the superintendent because I thought it was overkill" acknowledged that "there hasn't been any program in effect. I didn't want just any sub hacking it for the day. I was adamant. The U.F.T. said they would get someone suitable and they did but that only took place after the spring holiday. It wasn't in place until April 22."

One principal voiced the fear that the program has become "too politicized. I'm concerned -- not from a personal point of view, because I'm close to the end of my career -- that the program represents the start of changing the supervisor into a plain administrator and I think that's a danger." But most of the principals distanced themselves from their union's official stand against the M.T.I.P.:

- "The C.S.A. sees it as threatening...I don't."
- "I understand the C.S.A.'s position but I still have a school to run. I need all the help I can get...It's working out very well for me."
- "I don't have the negative feeling about the program that I hear about -- the fear that the mentor will take over the role of the AP...I see it as an auxiliary position that increases the number of people available to help teachers."
- "I've always viewed the program as something that helps me...It takes a tremendous load off my head in terms of teacher training. I don't have the time to do that. Any help is welcome."

With few exceptions, the principals reported that they were "dissatisfied" or "very dissatisfied" with the criteria used to select interns (one principal reported being unfamiliar with the criteria and, therefore, had "no opinion"). Nearly all agreed that the selection of interns should be determined at least in part by the principal's judgment of which teachers are most in need of mentoring.

Five of the principals were satisfied with the criteria used to select mentors. Of those who were not, one said candidly, "I didn't get my first choice. It was political. My U.F.T. representative made up his mind...People voted on them who didn't know them. I think there is a feeling that the principals control the schools too much. What's behind this is teacher control of the schools. I think the U.F.T is in control." One of the principals who reported being satisfied with the criteria used to select mentors explained that it was "because I had input."

The principals varied in their understanding of what their role vis à vis the program should be:

- "I am responsible for the success of the program and monitoring it."
- "Sitting on the sidelines and encouraging them to work together for the common good...I don't want to stick my two cents in when I see it's working well."
- "An overseer, to make sure everything's running smoothly."
- "My role is to stay in touch with and guide the mentor...to 'mentor the mentor.'"

- "I don't have any role. I wasn't encouraged to have any."
- "I don't know what's going on in the program, what the responsibilities of the mentors and interns are. I'm told not to interfere and whatever goes on between the mentor and the intern is private. That's the feeling I get. I don't know if they're supposed to give me copies of their logs."
- "To look for growth in the interns, which I have seen."
- "To make certain that the program was implemented as per the guidelines and that it was successful...I guess I failed on that one." (The mentor in this school, in referring to the principal and assistant principal, said, "They're doing it because they have to. They are supportive but they are not bending over backward to help.")
- "To be supportive -- to come up with ideas as to how to program this thing, to work out personality conflicts...."
- "Nothing. I protested by not taking part in the selection of the mentor."
- "We have no role. We're kept in the dark. We don't know what they're told in the workshops."

Most of the principals reported that the program did not entail more work for them:

- "I just let them run it."
- "I don't devote very much time to it because the mentor is very responsible."

There were four exceptions; generally the "more work" had to do with scheduling. But one principal said, "When I split up a class the children aren't learning. That makes for administrative problems and discipline issues. Parents have to be called."

Five principals reported that scheduling for the program had

been very easy:

- "We set up our program and we knew what we were going to do. All we had to do was plop them (subs) in."
- "I didn't even have to do it; a program staff member sat down with the mentor and the interns and they figured it out."
- "It was easy because of the leeway given by the Board."
- "The mentor is the programmer for the school!"

But for three of the principals interviewed, scheduling was reported to have been very difficult, or worse: "Devastating!" and "Impossible!"

Four of the principals said they did not expect problems to arise from the mentors and interns being out of their classrooms for up to 20 percent of their classroom assignments. One of the principals -- acknowledging that "I was extremely fortunate" -- explained that the mentor knew personally two teachers who wanted to work in the school as substitutes "and they're both excellent." The other principals seemed to take it for granted that there would be such problems, one going so far as to predict that reading and math scores would go down, particularly in the mentor's class. (See Chapter VI, p. 70).

The principals' suggestions for how to improve the M.T.I.P. clustered around the same themes as those of the mentors and interns: the inclusion of Temporary Per Diem (T.P.D.) teachers was at the top of everyone's list, with the exception of one principal who expressed the opinion that it would be not only "unnecessary" but "a waste of time and money" to train such

teachers "because you don't know if they're going to stay in the system." The difficulty in finding qualified substitute coverage was the catalyst for other recommendations: make the mentor a cluster teacher; make the mentor's position full-term; implement the program early to facilitate planning; and cut back on the number of out-of-classroom hours required; pay the mentor a stipend for working after school and/or weekends. Some of the principals wanted more input into the program, and others suggested that the Board do more monitoring.

MENTORS

Thirteen of the 16 mentors in the sample had advanced degrees. All but two of them were women. Their average age was 45 (the oldest was 64; the youngest, 35). They had been teaching for an average of more that 18 years (ranging from eight to 29 years).

Most of the mentors said that they were getting support as mentors from their principals, although in some cases that support was "passive"; the principals did not do anything to hinder the program but remained aloof from it. "The principal lets us do what we're supposed to do in the program"; "The principal doesn't bother me." One mentor reported that the principal "has been very supportive...got the coverage for us. The AP is the same...There have been a few problems...the principal doesn't want us to go to meetings if there are no good subs available...We were told, 'You can leave if you want to.' We lost those fights." Another mentor reported that the

principal "couldn't be better...always makes certain the coverage is there...Both the principal and the assistant principal are very supportive. We've been able to work within school hours because we have the time." At the other end of the spectrum was a mentor who reported that the principal was not supportive, to such an extent that "there is resentment among some of the other teachers because my class is split up for my release periods and goes to those teachers. The principal deliberately doesn't hire a sub for me."

The mentors reported that support from other sources varied. From teacher colleagues, there were different degrees of interest and cooperation; one mentor described collegial support as "tremendous"; another said, "I've depended on them; they've come through 100 percent," but this was not the general sentiment. Support from the district office was perceived, at best, as coming from a distance. "They don't seem to mind," was how one mentor put it. A mentor who described the district office as "very 'pro' the program" was referring to a district superintendent who had been the school's principal for the first half of the year and -- along with one other "hand-picked" principal in the district -- been <u>offered</u>, not given, the M.T.I.P. by the then acting superintendent, now the deputy. They were interviewed together and are, in fact, "very 'pro' the program."

Three mentors said they received support from the other mentor at the school: "She's <u>my</u> mentor!" and "I get support from

my mentor colleague. (The program) brought us a lot closer." One mentor reported that the children are supportive: "We got them involved."

Eleven of the mentors said they would apply to be mentors again. One of these responded with a half-hearted "Probably. I seem to do the job anyway." But most were more enthusiastic:

- "It was stimulating for me. I trust myself to protect my interns." (from a mentor in a school where the principal was seen as someone who "plays favorites.")
- "I enjoyed it. I was getting burned out as a teacher."
- "The idea of a system that's a teaching-learning experience for both mentor and intern, with so much commitment and energy devoted to it, is overwhelming."
- "I like the feeling of sharing, of trying to help and make life a little easier for her (the intern), to crystallize things for her, give her a positive attitude toward teaching."
- "I feel like I've grown from the experience. I've become a better teacher just from participating in the program. The training I've received has developed me professionally."
- "The first year we got though some of the worst hurdles, so we could really accomplish things from the beginning the next time."

Several mentors said they didn't know if they "would do it again":

- "Maybe, under other conditions...I'd love to do it full time."
- "The drawback is the time away from my own class."
- "It would depend...on whether my friends could come in to sub. The extra money was an incentive."

A mentor who said "no" explained, "I love the classroom and

six periods make a difference. Also, the interns designated aren't the ones who need it, like the T.P.D.'s." Another mentor said, "Not this way. I don't think the program is well thought out. I'm too divided. It takes too much time from my own class and I'm still responsible for them."

The two activities in the mentor/intern relationship which the mentors identified as most helpful to their interns were seeing others teach, and conferencing -- the opportunity to talk things over, ask questions and share problems. Interestingly, although the interns mentioned this activity as helpful, they placed much more emphasis on actually observing good teaching rather than talking about it -- indicating that there may be some unexpressed need of the mentors that this kind of interaction satisfied.

The mentors, like everyone else interviewed, felt strongly that the M.T.I.P. should be open to "brand new" teachers; one suggested that "anyone who wants help" should be eligible but that such people should be "anonymous so the principal doesn't know." Other suggestions for improving the program included reducing the amount of time required for teachers to be away from their classrooms; starting the program at the beginning of the school year; ensuring qualified coverage; and allotting time for the regular teacher and the sub to plan how the coverage will be done. One mentor wanted supervisors "to be involved. They should attend training with us to see we're not stepping on toes." Another mentor suggested "more monitoring by program

staff. There's the possibility of people not doing their job." (In this mentor's school, the principal compared another mentor negatively to the one just quoted; the principal said the other mentor used mentoring time to "bellyache" to the intern). A mentor who "loved being a mentor" (although "more to one intern than the other") asked that the paperwork associated with the program be "streamlined."

INTERNS

Of the 28 interns -- all of whom were women -- in the sample, all had prior teaching experience. Most had been in the same school last year as T.P.D.'s; several had years of experience teaching in private or parochial schools or other public school systems. Twenty-two had undergraduate degrees in education; twelve had master's degrees, 11 of which are in education.

Most of the interns said that their education had prepared them well for teaching; several noted, however, that they hadn't been prepared for this system:

- "I was well prepared in content but there are real problems in New York City. You can't be educated for all that. Student teaching is done in a closed atmosphere."
- "It prepared me for what to teach but not for the conditions. They show you the best and then you find out the worst."
- "I got the frills, not the nuts and bolts."
- "Bookwise it was fine but it was unrealistic. They base it all on children who aren't having problems. I've never seen such anger in children -- they don't want to learn...."

Twenty-two of the 28 interns said that teaching had been their first career choice. With two exceptions all of the interns were teaching in their area of certification.

About half of the interns said that, compared to their expectations, their first few months of teaching had been a trying experience:

- "Terrible. I didn't know the system at all."
- "Much harder..."
- "Shocking...There were so many children. I had no input from administrators; everything was trial and error."
- "Horrible! Overwhelming...I didn't know what I was doing."
- "I was disappointed with the materials. It's almost depressing. You can't get this, you can't get that. You have to buy everything yourself, so the teachers who have more money -- their classrooms look the best."
- I'd planned to start teaching on a higher level. I expected the children to be at a more advanced level than they turned out to be."
- A definite christening...Not only was it a challenge, it was really rough. At times, I felt it was like a battleground."
- I was not prepared for the problem of a poor community."

Other interns said of the first few months:

- "Basically what I expected...except for the paperwork."
- "The same as I expected -- very difficult."
- "I knew it was going to be very hard. It's much better now than it was. The program helped a lot...I had someone to talk to."

But there were a few for whom even the first few months were more than positive:

- "Wonderful."
- "Even better than I expected."

The activity in the M.T.I.P. that nearly all of the interns identified as the "most helpful" was watching other teachers teach. One intern, referring to her relationship with the mentor, said, "In terms of doing anything as a team, we don't." But, she reported, "I have been utilizing release time to observe other teachers on my own." The other intern in the school, one of only two in the entire sample where the program is not actually functioning, also arranges, on her own, to visit colleagues' classrooms. Only one intern in the entire sample said that "nothing" in the M.T.I.P. was helpful: "I could use the time more profitably both for the class and for myself."

Most of the interns felt that their absence from their classrooms was disruptive to the children, making them more difficult to "manage." But one kindergarten teacher pointed out that it was developmental for the children to relate to more than one adult. Another teacher among the minority of interns who did not regard being out of the class as a necessary (or unnecessary) evil spoke happily of a substitute who teaches Spanish, to the children's delight, and still another reported that her students had been affected "not at all" by her absence: "The subs have been excellent. I leave my plan book with whomever is covering me...." The availability of reliable, qualified substitute teachers greatly affected interns' perceptions of how problematic their absence was; as one intern acknowledged: "My kids had a bad

year, but it's not the program."

With a few exceptions, the interns said that their teaching had been positively affected by their participation in the program. The intern who said that nothing had "really" changed explained that she had taught before -- 19 years ago for four years -- and that her mentor was not in her field. An intern in one of the two schools where the program never got off the ground pointed out, "We didn't spend enough time to know if it did any good." And another intern said, "It has hurt me, if anything, in discipline. My routine's been disrupted." But, in general, the interns expressed deep appreciation for their mentors' support and shared expertise. "If it was not for the program, I would have had a very rough time," said one. And another intern described the effect of her participation on her students: "I'm walking on firmer ground, and they feel it."

The major recommendations which interns had for improving the M.T.I.P. were to start the program at or even before the beginning of the school year (in some schools the program did not get underway until December; in one it only "began" in the last week of April); to extend intern eligibility to "brand new" teachers, particularly T.P.D.'s; and to reduce the time that mentors and interns are required to be out of their classrooms. Among their other recommendations: eliminate the "appearance of 'sameness' between mentor and intern"; reduce the paperwork. One intern criticized the Central Board for "talking down to us" in workshops.

CHAPTER CHAIRPERSONS

According to all 11 chapter chairpersons interviewed, most of the teachers in their schools were not particularly aware of or interested in the M.T.I.P.; in one school the other teachers did not know that the interns are "interns." The chapter chairpersons generally did not attribute this lack of awareness to their principals, whom they described as being supportive of the program (with the exceptions of the principal whose choice for mentor was not ratified by the Selection Committee and who was described by the chapter chairperson as having subsequently become "actively unsupportive" of the program, and of another principal described by the chapter chairperson as "unsupportive ...resistant to releasing the mentor and interns; only a total of nine release periods, not 18, has been allowed (to the mentor and two interns); the principal has expressed the feeling that (she/he) is not in favor of the program to me." In that school, the chapter chairperson said of the teaching staff, "I don't know how aware they are that the program is in existence at all" and added that "the principal met with the interns prior to the implementation of the program to denigrate it; I met with the interns to turn them around."

Most of the chapter chairpersons said that they personally regard the M.T.I.P. in its conception and implementation as a "good idea"; "I wish I had it when I started," said one chapter chairperson frankly. Only one of the 11 chapter chairpersons was unambivalently opposed to the M.T.I.P.: "I don't feel it's a

good program. It's a cheap way of getting at teacher training."

In line with the literature on the subject, the chapter chairpersons ascribed the low retention rate among first year teachers to the "sink or swim" perspective towards them:

- "New teachers have no place to go for help. The appointment of supervisors is politicized. They're concerned with not making waves. They're too worried about their own jobs to train anyone else."
- "They're not prepared. They're in shock. Prior to the M.T.I.P. they weren't getting too much help. They have no one to walk them through and they're scared to make mistakes."
- "There's very little true support, and new teachers are overwhelmed. Most administrators, because they evaluate, can't be supportive."

The chapter chairpersons' recommendations for improving the program echoed those made by everyone else interviewed: include T.P.D.s; implement the program earlier. One chapter chairperson suggested that a faculty conference be held for the specific purpose of explaining the M.T.I.P. to the entire teaching staff.

DISTRICT OFFICE PERSONNEL

All of the district office (D.O.) personnel interviewed indicated that the decision to participate in the M.T.I.P. had been made by the superintendent because the program conformed with a personal and/or D.O. philosophy and commitment; there was virtually no impact on the decision from other "constituencies" above or below, within or outside, the D.O. office:

- "We can use all the help we can get. Even though the C.S.A claims mentors are usurping their role, there's enough work for everyone! This was a need. We can use more mentors."

- "We encouraged the School Board to permit us to try it."
- "It would improve the morale of the school for a superior teacher to go into a supervisory role, and it was not costly."

Like the chapter chairpersons interviewed, the D.O. personnel believed that the low rate of retention among first year teachers is attributable in large part to those teachers' isolation:

- "Classrooms are very insulated. The message is 'you're supposed to know what you're doing' and they don't have someone to speak to."
- "They don't know what to expect. They don't get the kind of support that a person in a brand new situation requires."

But other reasons are cited as well:

- "Student teaching is not realistic. There's a lack of preparation, and much of what they do get is irrelevant. There are a negligible number of student teachers in this District but then they get assigned here."

Like those closer to the program, the D.O. personnel recommended that eligibility criteria for interns be expanded to include T.P.D.'s: "That's clearly the intent of the law," and that mentors be full-time. One suggested that "there be more of a direct relationship with teacher training institutions." A final comment included the recommendation that "the principal should have the final say, not only input, in the selection of mentors. "There's less than an enthusiastic response from principals because of their exclusion from the process...If a principal doesn't want mentoring in a school there won't be...."

## V. FINAL IMPRESSIONS: LOOKING BACK

SURVEYS

Thirty-two mentors responded to the Mentor Survey #3, which asked them to assess the impact of the M.T.I.P. on the development of selected mentoring skills.

On a scale of 1 to 4, where 1 equaled "not helpful at all" and 4 equalled "very helpful," the mentors rated the program between 3 and 3.7 in developing 18 different skills and self-perceptions identified with the mentoring role. The mentors rated the program most helpful in the areas of "sharing experiences about stress and coping mechanisms," "being able to diagnose interns' needs," "providing advice," "developing self-confidence as a teacher," "becoming sensitive to different teaching styles," "feeling better about being a teacher," and "perceiving that your work is valued by others."

More than 90 percent of these mentors said that the M.T.I.P. responded to their "needs for support and professional growth" in the mentor role.

Twenty-nine interns -- slightly more than 40 percent of all interns -- responded to the analogous Intern Survey #4. Using the same 1 to 4 scale, the interns evaluated the program as having been somewhat less helpful to them in developing particular skills and self-perceptions, rating it between 2.8 and 3.2. The highest ratings were given to "development of self-confidence as a teacher," "feeling comfortable in exchanging

ideas with people with whom you work," "use of management skills which make good use of time and other resources, minimize interruptions, and keep students engaged," "feeling comfortable in approaching and working with other teachers," "knowing where to turn in the school when you need to resolve problems," and "perceiving that teaching is work through which you can express yourself."

Thirty-six interns responded to a similar but more extensive survey, Intern Survey #3, in which they were asked to evaluate how far they had progressed in 28 skill areas on a scale of 1 to 7, where 1 equalled "I am just beginning to look at this matter" and 7 equalled "I have developed this matter into one of my strengths."

These interns rated their progress between 4.6 and 6.05, with the highest ratings going to "I have established a good rapport with my students, as individuals and as a group" and "I know where to turn in the school(s) when I need to resolve problems" (thereby corroborating the results of Intern Survey #4).

A control group of eight first year teachers who were not in the M.T.I.P rated their own progress between 4.5 and 6.0. Members of the control group perceived themselves as having made less progress than the interns perceived themselves as having made in 25 out of the 28 skill areas. Members of the control group rated their progress slightly higher in having "established class routines which students understand and follow," in

participating "in the profession (through organizations and associations) which enhances my work and sense of self," and in managing "well the demands of teaching along with the demands of my personal life" than the interns rated their own progress.

The interns who responded to Intern Survey #4 had taught for an average of 3.1 years, as compared to 3.5 years of teaching experience reported by the control group.

Teacher Effectiveness

In responding to a question on Mentor Survey #3 asking them to describe how the M.T.I.P. had helped them to increase their effectiveness as teachers, the mentors said:

- "I've become much more aware of new research in the field. It has enabled me to conceptualize things I know intuitively. It is making me consider staying in the system after 20 years. It has broadened my range of teaching experience to adults (I am giving informed workshops). I am more assertive and aware in using techniques and dealing with other adults and administration."

- "Because of the fact that others were looking to me for help and advice (not only interns but staff), I was 'on my toes' and interested and excited to always put my best foot forward."

- "My planning was more thoughtful in terms of predicting problems and presenting the subject matter in more creative ways. Whether in or out of the classroom, I was always modelling behavior (child; parent; administrator; colleague; teacher; intern). Positive feedback forced me into risk-taking behavior. I began to read more professional literature and process same to meet my needs."

Thirty interns responded to the same question on Intern Survey #4:

- "The Mentor Intern Program has made me receptive to a wider variety of strategies of classroom management and

scheduling. My class has run more smoothly and I feel I've been better able to focus on 'where the action is,' academically and behaviorally as well."

- "...I feel that I have a bond of confidence and trust with my mentor. This has helped significantly to reduce new teacher 'jitters' and give me confidence in my classroom. I always had someone to go to for information or a solution to the myriad of problems that arise every day. My mentor has been invaluable in giving confidence and a new perspective to the professionalism in teaching."

- "I have been able to supplement my instructional strategies by incorporating techniques used by others that I have observed. I have also been able to participate with other teachers in multi-class enterprises and projects through the program."

- "I am now more acquainted with many school policies that I was unaware of before. I am now also more comfortable in asking for help from other teachers."

Job Satisfaction

The M.T.I.P. had an extraordinarily positive impact on mentors' job satisfaction. In response to a question on Mentor Survey #3, mentors said:

- "I have just begun to see a 'glimmer' of growth in students and interns. I feel rejuvenated as a teacher."

- "I've realized that I, along with my colleagues, have much to offer to the children and each other. There has been a kind of re-birth."

- "It has given me a new and fresh outlook on teaching and learning. I love helping others because I love teaching. The program has helped me feel a self worth which is greatly needed after 18 years or more of teaching."

- "I think at this time in my career I needed the diversity that the mentor program offered this year. I feel revitalized!"

In response to the same question on Intern Survey #4, the interns reported,

- "Last year I was ready to leave teaching. After being in this program I have learned to adjust and plan to remain in the teaching profession."

- "I tried out many new ideas with my students and found great satisfaction when my many objectives were accomplished."

- "I have made new professional relationships and feel much more kinship with my colleagues now. My job is also more interesting and easier now that I have acquired new teaching strategies."

- "Having the time to observe other classes has helped in my own class. I am more confident in front of the class and also much more aware of the students and their individual differences."

Nearly 80 percent of the interns responding to this survey said they planned to continue teaching in their current assignment during 1987-88. As one intern wrote:

- "I was considering not returning or leaving teaching because of isolation and uncertainty about my capabilities, but I am more enthusiastic now and feel much more confidence in my abilities."

Fifteen principals and 19 assistant principals responded to the Supervisor Post-Survey. Sixty percent of the principals and 53 percent of the assistant principals said that the M.T.I.P. had a positive effect on the interns:

- The interns were good teachers. They are now even better teachers. Their enthusiasm has spilled over on some of the teachers who have been teaching a long time."

- "From good teachers to better teachers -- sharing their wealth of knowledge with the rest of the staff."

- "Vast improvements (academic), enormous growth and development."

- "More confidence as a teacher (especially in the area of discipline)."

Those principals who thought that the program had a

negative effect on the interns said,

- " ...Detached completely from administrators who comply with schoolwide projects."
- "The program has had a negative effect in terms of inexperienced subs covering interns and mentor so that the children in those classes have lost out."

Their negative sentiments were echoed by 21 percent of the assistant principals:

- "...more aloofness and detachment from administration..."
- "...The discipline problems that arose by an inept cluster thrust upon us to cover their classes was a disaster and handicapped pupil achievement."

Seventy-three percent of the principals thought that the program had a positive effect on the mentors, but fewer than half of the assistant principals thought so. One assistant principal argued,

- "If mentoring was given to the A.P. or supervisors, the release time (5-6 periods per week) would not be an issue for negative infighting among teachers."
- "Many of the staff were distressed over the selection process for mentors."
- "Staff morale was low as more highly competent teachers should have been selected -- UFT rep selected the mentor above all other recommendations of staff members."
- "Other staff members were concerned with extra time -- which they felt was unnecessary and a loss to students. Initial problem of covering interns and mentors was seen as 'typical' Board of Education plan not planned properly."

Nearly 32 percent of the assistant principals also thought that the program had a negative effect on other teaching staff--but exactly the same proportion said it had a positive effect. On the one hand:

- "Teachers that I approached to give demonstration lessons for the groups refused. They commented that the mentor was paid to do it -- they weren't. Also, on emergency days when teachers lost coverage they resented people who received two preps when they lost their prep."

- "...It caused envy among staff members."

And on the other:

- "Many staff members have voluntarily visited mentor classrooms. It has become a positive contagious routine of utmost benefit to all."

- "A feeling of love and support. Other staff also sought mentors for assistance."

Suggestions

The mentors, in particular, had many concrete suggestions for improving the M.T.I.P. in the areas of scheduling, coverage, professional development, services to mentors, new teacher training and the retention of both veteran and new teachers. A representative sample:

- "Arrangements must be made prior to the opening of school in September. If necessary, the chancellor's office must mandate the required scheduling."

- "You need a reliable, competent coverage teacher -- that's the key to the whole program."

- "There should be a regular, experienced cluster teacher taking over the class when the mentor is out of the room. This way, no disruption of learning occurs."

- "Coverage teachers should be advertised positions so that they can be experienced teachers, expert in a particular area of instruction."

- "More workshops with mentor/intern dialogue."

- "Workshops within a district to provide for learning and teaching strategies."

- "Mentors should be able to meet with other mentors in their districts to share strategies and any problems that

may arise on a monthly basis. Our district did this and it was great."

- "Include T.P.D.'s, returning teachers, teachers wishing to change license or grade level."

- "Make sure that interns are really new teachers, not simply teachers fitting the criteria of the program."

- "The program (and mentor) should be available to help any teacher (new or old) who is calling out for help. Many teachers would welcome the opportunity to observe skills and materials."

Some supervisors shared their sentiments, in particular about the need for early scheduling and less bureaucratized criteria for intern selection. One assistant principal wrote,

- "The legislation is too rigid !! The teachers who really needed to be interns were excluded because they were T.P.D.'s. That part of the regulations must be changed!"

Asked to make additional comments regarding the M.T.I.P. in their schools, several supervisors took the opportunity to suggest alternatives to it:

- "I believe there is a place for 'buddy' teachers but the job of teacher training should rest with the licensed A.P. and principal. If you have money to give away, give an administrative assistant and free the current supervisors of non-educational chores and let us do the job we were trained to do."

- "...why spend money piloting new programs? Replace the assistant principals who were cut from the schools during the budget crisis..."

- "I still believe the program should use veteran retired staff as mentors. This gives greater flexibility to the program and doesn't pull the mentor out of her program."

Among those who were asked to look back on the M.T.I.P. in its first year were the Program Supervisor, a Special Assistant to the Executive Director of Curriculum and Instruction in the New York City Board of Education, and the two program

Coordinators --one of whom came from the U.F.T. and the other from D.C.I. The Program Supervisor's job was "to make sure the program got rolling," and then to oversee its overall implementation, functioning as a "trouble-shooter." The Program Coordinators, the liaisons between the program and the participating schools, each had her own regional responsibilities: one oversaw schools in Manhattan, the Bronx and Queens; the other had oversight in Brooklyn. Their recommendations for improving the program stemmed from the city-wide overview they had of it -- where it had worked best and where, in the words of one Coordinator, the "glitches" had occurred. Their recommendations centered on two main themes, communication and early implementation:

- "The Superintendents should have closer contact with the principals from the beginning."
- "More communication from the District Office to the principals, who often had inadequate and faulty information."
- "More communication with parents."
- "Implement the program as early as possible -- identify the interns, select the mentors, begin staff development."
- "Early implementation would allow the schools sufficient time to get more appropriate coverage; where the M.T.I.P. worked best, it was truly woven into the school program."

Their assessment of the program overall was very positive:

- "The collaboration between the Board of Education and U.F.T. worked well. It benefited both parties."
- "The mentors far surpassed any estimate the selection committees had regarding the calibre of the teachers they were choosing. A uniformity of excellence came out

of every selection committee."

- "We learned the distinction between a policy statement made by a professional association and reality. By and large, the principals and assistant principals were pleased. They didn't see it as a threat."

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Comparisons were made between the reading and mathematics achievement of M.I.T.P. interns' students and other new teachers' students.* Analyses of covariance were performed on students' 1987 reading and mathematics test scores to determine whether achievement differed significantly among the two groups. Pretest scores obtained in 1986 were used as covariates to control for initial differences in achievement.

When adjusted for initial differences, M.T.I.P. interns' students showed posttest scores of 44.3 and 49.3 N.C.E.s in mathematics and reading, while other new teachers' students showed posttest scores of 43.4 and 47.3 N.C.E.s in mathematics and reading, respectively. Thus, interns' students showed scores of 0.9 and 2.0 N.C.E.s higher in mathematics and reading, respectively, than the scores of the other new teachers' students. The differences between the scores of the two groups were not statistically significant.

This appears to indicate that although the M.T.I.P. interns spent time outside their classrooms while a substitute covered, their students' achievement was comparable to the achievement of students whose teachers, also new, spent all their time with their classes.

---

*Students of 23 M.T.I.P. teachers and eight other new teachers were used in the analyses.

## VI. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Whatever their differences, there was an overwhelming consensus among all of those interviewed/surveyed that there is a need for the training of new teachers in the New York City public school system. And the great majority of them agreed as well that mentoring -- non-evaluative, "in situ" peer teaching that provides new teachers with the opportunity to watch good teachers teach -- has a unique value. It neither competes with other training contexts and methods nor is it interchangeable with them.

As participant evaluations of the first mentor training workshop last November predicted they would, mentors as well as interns benefited from participation in the M.T.I.P. Many of those interviewed/surveyed recognized that the advantages included not only the sense of esteem and gratification that come from official recognition of excellence, but also the new knowledge and skills that make excellent teachers even better. Several mentors mentioned the alleviation of burnout as a positive "side effect" of their participation in the program, and others mentioned the role the M.T.I.P. would play in helping them up the career ladder.

Most of the principals, as well, acknowledged not only that the program had confounded its opponents by avoiding predicted dilemmas but that it had, in fact, lifted some of the burden of their very demanding jobs.

Except in a very few cases, where the principals were

actively opposed to the presence of the M.T.I.P. in their schools and more or less openly sabotaged it, the program worked well -- in every school that participated in it.

In fact, in comparing the reading and mathematics achievement of a sample of M.T.I.P. interns' students with the achievement of a sample of students of new teachers who were not participants in the program, it was found that the interns' students showed gains of two and one N.C.E.s -- in reading and mathematics, respectively -- higher than the gains of the other new teachers' students. The differences in achievement between the two groups, however, were not statistically significant.

To the extent that there were problems associated with the implementation of the M.T.I.P., it is abundantly clear that the program didn't cause inadequate substitute coverage -- the "root of all evil" in this context. In fact, the program tended to be scapegoated for this and other problems that it highlighted but did not cause. To the extent that the M.T.I.P. was "unpopular" with supervisors and other teaching staff, that appears to be the reason.

These are some of the issues and concerns that became salient in the analyses of the various surveys and in the course of the on-site visits:

- Intern selection. Should mentoring be mandatory? Who needs mentoring and who makes that decision? Should the criteria for eligibility include subjective considerations -- does a particular teacher, new or not, want a mentor? Or does the principal, another supervisor, or an experienced teacher colleague think a new teacher needs a mentor? If selection as an intern becomes associated with poor performance (as judged by

supervisors or colleagues) rather than inexperience (as defined by solely objective criteria), then intern may become a stigmatized label, which could adversely affect the mentor-intern relationship and its efficacy.

- New teacher preparation. What kind of preparation do teachers new to the system need? "Everyone" agreed that new teachers are unprepared. A few mentioned subject areas, but that seemed to be the least of the interns' troubles. Many talked about the paper work. But what most teachers indicated they were in fact unprepared for (and this was not only true of new teachers) was the dire poverty they encountered in the neighborhoods where the participating schools were located and the profound social and psychological destabilization -- of communities, families, people -- that such deprivation creates. This was what often got referred to obliquely or euphemistically as "the conditions." These teachers were indeed unprepared for them, as they were for their own reactions to them -- feelings of intimidation, debilitation and impotence. If the M.T.I.P. is to play a role in preparing teachers to be competent, stable members of the public school system, this issue must be addressed ("getting used to it" is not the same as being prepared for it).

- Supervisory involvement. What should be the involvement of principals and other supervisors in a mentoring program? If the program functions as an autonomous activity and structure within the school, does that necessarily undermine the education leader's authority, as some principals feel it did? Or is such autonomy necessary to establish and maintain the interns' trust, which the mentors identified as the "first step" mentors must take?

- Community support. Is a "public relations" effort necessary to muster support within and outside the school for the program? In most cases, little had been done to include other teachers in the program even as "cheer-leaders," and nothing at all to let parents know that an investment was being made in their children's education and to solicit their support. A pervasive cynicism towards "most teachers here" and "most parents in this community" led to the asumption that, in regard to the M.T.I.P., other teachers and parents "don't take and interest," but nothing had been done to elicit it. In the one school where the children were brought into the mentor-intern relationship ("The mentor is my teacher like I'm yours"), the trauma -- perceived and actual -- predicted and reported in connection with teachers' absence from their classrooms was non-existent.

The recommendations made here are based on a distillation of suggestions put forward by participants in the M.T.I.P. and others associated with it, inferences drawn from their comments on and criticisms of the program, and observations made during site visits to selected schools.

Substitute coverage. Implement a substitute recruitment program, linked to the M.T.I.P. in funding and organization, that would guarantee competent, reliable coverage in participating schools. Even a perfect mentoring program will not be wanted and will not work without such coverage.

Public relations. Include people in the M.T.I.P. District Superintendents should meet with and explain the program to principals, who in turn should take responsibility for introducing it to other teaching staff, chapter chairpersons, parents and students. Let the program be something that the entire school community takes an interest in and is proud of. In particular, teachers who substitute for mentors and interns should be made an integral part of the mentoring team and included in joint lesson planning, etc. No one can be expected to support what they've never heard of.

Nevertheless, mentor-intern confidentiality should be retained. Theirs is a different relationship from that of supervisor and teacher and should not be conflated with it.

Early implementation. Inform principals, mentors and interns about the program before the start of the school year. Not only will early implementation facilitate scheduling for principals,

but it will model planning for the interns -- who need the mentor most in the first days and weeks of the school year so that they can get off to a good start.

Intern selection. Include the T.P.D.'s. Exempt experienced teachers who are new to the New York City public school system but not to teaching. They (and other experienced teachers) may need some other kind of help but the program is designed for teachers who need mentoring.

Staff development. Provide mentors with hands on, role playing-based training in mentoring rather than instruction in subject areas. Allow mentors to devise their own workshop syllabuses to reflect the advanced level of instruction that they would find educative. Provide sensitivity-training to interns that prepares them for the racial and cultural differences, and tensions, they will find in their schools and for their own reactions to them.

## APPENDIX A

For the purposes of coding, mentors and interns could describe their activities in the following terms:

Conferencing, in which the participants conduct an interchange of views;

Consulting, in which one or more participants is asked to provide advice or an opinion of a particular problem(s) to be solved;

Designing/Developing, in which participants create an instructional method, curriculum package, curriculum plans, instructional materials, or new uses for materials or technologies;

Distributing, which occurs when materials, pamphlets, books, newsletters, etc. are sent to participant(s) and the user(s) are informed of the substance of the materials sent;

Facilitating, in which a participant makes arrangements, appointments, and/or visitations possible for the person(s) involved;

Informing, in which a participant provides information of a specific kind on a specific topic;

Locating, in which a participant finds materials, information, ideas, and/or plans for a particular need;

Networking, in which a participant(s) shares and/or exchanges ideas for the purpose of interacting with professionals outside one's normal realm of experience;

Preparing/Planning, in which a participant manages the organization of other activities so that they are coherently

related and integrated;

Relationship Building, in which participants work together towards strengthening trust, confidence, security and positive attitudes;

Training, in which special activities are conducted for the purpose of improving a teachers's (s') skills; to introduce different strategies or the use of a particular curriculum; and

Viewing/Visiting, in which participant(s) visits a colleague teacher's classroom to view a particular lesson/activity.

APPENDIX B

For purposes of coding, the following were identified as possible "topics" of the M.T.I.P. activities:

Art
Classroom Management
Computing
Dealing with Parents
Discipline
English as a Second Language
Foreign Language
Library
Math
Music
Other Language Arts
Physical/Health Education
Procedural Items
Reading
Reasoning Skills
Report Cards
Science
Social Studies
Student Records
Testing/Teacher-made Test Construction
Writing
Strategies
Program Aspects
Equipment
Materials
Proposal Writing
Supervisory Observation
Student Performance
Learning Centers
Bulletin Boards
Homework
U.F.T. Matters
Training/Meeting (topic)